

REMARKS

Double Patenting Rejection

The entry of a Terminal Disclaimer herewith renders this rejection moot.

Applicant submitted a Terminal Disclaimer along with the 01-19-2006 response to the non-final Office action of 08-11-2005. However, because the Power of Attorney had not been updated in this continuation case (counsel for Applicant moved to a different law firm since the time of filing the parent case), this first submission of a Terminal Disclaimer was rejected. After updating the Power of Attorney, a second Terminal Disclaimer was filed 05-31-2006.

The Examiner subsequently refused to enter this second-filed Terminal Disclaimer due to Applicant's failure to give good and sufficient reasons for not having filed the Terminal Disclaimer sooner. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the explanation above constitutes good and sufficient reason for not having properly filed the Terminal Disclaimer sooner, since Applicant made a *bona fide* attempt to submit the Terminal Disclaimer along with the response to the non-final rejection and diligently updated the Power of Attorney and re-filed the Terminal Disclaimer when the error was discovered.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the independent and dependent claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided so that an interview may be scheduled.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Grant D. Kang/

By: Grant D. Kang, Esq. Reg. No. 37,651
Husch & Eppenberger, LLC
190 Carondelet Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-480-1640
314-480-1505 FAX